DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 097 948 JC 740 442

AUTHOR Baber, Lewis E.
TITLE A Study of How Richmond Technical Institute Can Improve the Quality of Technical and Vocational Teaching with a More Defined Accountability Program and Possible Steps to Encourage Educators to Be More Receptive to Accountability.
PUB DATE 20 Apr 74
NOTE 41p.; Practicum submitted to Nova University in partial fulfillment of requirements for Doctor of Education degree

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Community Colleges; *Educational Accountability; *Institutional Research; Post Secondary Education; Practicums; Surveys; Teacher Attitudes; *Technical Education; *Technical Institutes; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS North Carolina; North Carolina Community College System; *Richmond Technical Institute

ABSTRACT

This is a study of educational accountability at Richmond Technical Institute. The primary purpose of this study was to devise a systematic method in which the institute could become more accountable, both externally to Richmond County and internally to its students. The paper examines the problems of developing an accountability model. In addition to the formal research of related literature, data were collected in a telephone survey of 14 technical institutes and community colleges in the North Carolina Community College System. Another instrument used was a checklist-type opinionnaire given to instructors and administrators at the institute. Analysis of the opinionnaire data showed a pronounced difference of opinions among instructors and administrators. These differences could be attributed to their understanding or lack of understanding of the term "accountability." Implementing a program of accountability at the Richmond Technical Institute will require changes in traditional educational attitudes. (Author/DB)

ED 097948

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

A STUDY OF HOW RICHMOND TECHNICAL INSTITUTE CAN IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF TECHNICAL AND VOCATIONAL TEACHING WITH A MORE DEFINED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM AND POSSIBLE STEPS TO ENCOURAGE EDUCATORS TO BE MORE RECEPTIVE TO ACCOUNTABILITY

by

Lewis E. Baber, M.A.C.T.

Richmond Technical Institute

A PRACTICUM PRESENTED TO NOVA UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

NOVA UNIVERSITY

April 20, 1974

JC 740 442

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES iii

INTRODUCTION 1

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE 4

What Does Accountability Mean? 4

Models and Approaches 10

Possible Problems and Barriers to Change 15

PROCEDURES AND RESULTS 16

RECOMMENDATIONS 25

APPENDIX

A. Schools Surveyed 31

B. Opinionnaire 32

BIBLIOGRAPHY 36

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
°I.	Name and Location of Schools Surveyed	18
II.	Types of Accountability Programs North Carolina Technical Institutes and Community Colleges 1973-74	19
III.	Percentage Comparison of Opinionnaire Given at Richmond Technical Institute	20

A STUDY OF HOW RICHMOND TECHNICAL INSTITUTE CAN IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF TECHNICAL AND VOCATIONAL TEACHING WITH A MORE DEFINED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM AND POSSIBLE STEPS TO ENCOURAGE EDUCATORS TO BE MORE RECEPTIVE TO ACCOUNTABILITY

INTRODUCTION

The primary purpose of this study is to devise a systematic method in which Richmond Technical Institute can become more accountable both externally to Richmond County and internally to the students that pass through our doors. It is the feeling of the writer that many educators, not only at Richmond Technical Institute, but all over the country view accountability negatively; that is, as a burden rather than a useful tool.

There appears to be conflict among administrators and instructors as to what accountability is and how it should be utilized in technical institutes and community colleges. The word "accountability" is laden with a host of meanings. It may seem threatening and unreasonable to educators who are reluctant to accept responsibility for academically inept and poorly motivated students; it may be viewed as a challenge and a useful tool to other educators.

The writer conducted a survey of the instructors at Richmond Technical Institute which revealed that almost all

subscribe to the concept of the open door, however, only a few provided programs or teaching methods appropriate for non-traditional students - which happen to be a large percent of our student body.

Mr. Joseph H. Nanney, President of Richmond Technical Institute, has requested that I undertake this study for my practicum to develop an accountability model or plan keyed to the needs of Richmond Technical Institute.

Richmond Technical Institute would like to incorporate an accountability plan within the institution to promote positive change and be more accountable externally to Richmond County and internally to our students.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

During the last few years accountability has rapidly become a popular and controversial concept among educators. Students have always been accountable. Now that some technical institutes and community colleges are agreeing to share with students the responsibility for student learning, decisions must be made in regard to different aspects of accountability. If Richmond Technical Institute is to be judged not by what it promises, but by how students perform, answers must be found to the question, "Who is accountable to whom and for what?"

Accountability has come to mean that someone or something should be held responsible for the attainment of

specific objectives as just return for an investment of time, energy and money.

In other words, the board, administrators, and faculty of Richmond Technical Institute should be held responsible for the learning of its students.

The question many educators seem to have is whether accountability is truly possible, whether administrators and faculty can be held responsible for student learning, whether a true assessment can actually take place, and in fact, will the end result justify the resources expended to achieve it.

Education in the technical institute and community college has been challenged and the challenger is the concept of accountability. Not only Richmond Technical Institute, but all technical institutes and community colleges, more than any other area of education must answer the challenge, for they alone have evolved as a result of public demand for better, more specialized and more personalized educational programs and programs that are more responsive to community needs. The question facing both instructors and administrators at Richmond Technical Institute, then, is not whether instructors or administrators should be held accountable, since this cannot be avoided: the question is how systematic accountability should be in order to be most effective.

Whether we like it or not, we have already entered what Lessinger calls "the age of accountability in education." Rather than respond defensively by regarding accountability as a threat, we should adopt it positively as a professional responsibility.[1]

It should be made clear that teachers should not become scapegoats. Teachers cannot be accountable unless the concept of accountability permeates the entire spectrum of institutional responsibility.[2]

In a broad sense, accountability at Richmond Technical Institute should mean that the board of trustees, president, administrators, and teachers will be held responsible for the performance of its students.

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

What Does Accountability Mean?

The contemporary concepts of accountability in education probably come to light when Leon Lessinger identified what he termed the three basic rights of democratic education.[3] The first of these rights assumed by Lessinger was that "each child has a right to be taught what he needs to know in order

---

[1]George A. Baker III, Richard L. Browell, and John E. Roueche, Accountability and the Community College (Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1971), p.6.

[2]Ibid., p.8.

[3]Leon M. Lessinger, Every Kid A Winner: Accountability in Education (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970), pp.4-9.

to take a productive and rewarding part in our society."[4] There is probably no educator at Richmond Technical Institute or citizen in Richmond County who would refuse to accept this right as fundamental to our community or society. But, Lessinger has further clarified his definition of the child's right to learn by indicating that it includes the right of citizens to have objective proof that the child can use his skills and apply his knowledge in society.[5] While it is likely that few educators at Richmond Technical Institute or citizens in the community would disagree with this right, the practical problem of finding objective measures to prove that right has been achieved is fraught with many difficulties.

The second basic right of democratic education, as identified by Lessinger, is the right of "the taxpayer and his elected representative...to know what educational results are produced by a given expenditure."[6] The writer feels that most of the faculty and staff at Richmond Technical Institute would accept this as an appropriate goal to strive for, however, they would appropriately recognize that it would take a tremendous amount of effort and financial resources to accomplish even an acceptable level of precision in comparing educational results with expenditures. The

---

[4] Ibid., pp.4-5.

[5] Ibid., p.5.

[6] Ibid., p.4.

writer feels that such reservations should not be used as excuses for refusing to attempt to measure educational accomplishments in relation to resources utilized.

In further discussion of educational accountability, Lessinger referred to the need for "educational engineering," a process by which "we define exactly what we want, then bring together resources and technology in such a way as to assure those results."[7] He established several criteria for a well-engineered educational program:

> It will require educational planners to specify, in measurable terms, what they are trying to accomplish. It will provide for an independent audit of results. It will allow taxpayers and their representatives to judge the educational payoff of a given appropriation. It will stimulate a continuing process of innovation, not merely a oneshot reform. It will call forth educational ideas, talent and technology from all sectors of our society, not only from within a particular school system. It will allow schools to experiment with new programs at limited risk and adopt the best of them promptly. Above all, it will guarantee results in what students can actually do.[8]

It is quite apparent that the term accountability, as

---

[7] Ibid., pp.12-13.

[8] Ibid.

it is applied to education, has been viewed in many different and often contrasting ways by professional educators and citizens. Some have seen accountability as a panacea which will solve all of our educational problems, while others are convinced that it will eventually result in the crippling of the community college system. The attitude survey taken at Richmond Technical Institute will support this (Table III). Some see educational accountability as a simple term while others see so many complexities in it that they cannot bring themselves to consider its potentially positive aspects.

It is the writer's opinion that many of these contrasting viewpoints regarding educational accountability have developed because of failure to obtain any agreement among professional educators and citizens on a workable definition of the term. (Before undertaking this study the writer was uncertain as to the concept of accountability as it would apply to Richmond Technical Institute.) Barro defined accountability as the holding of professional educators responsible for what students learn.[9] Glass views accountability as involving disclosure of the services being sold to the public, performance testing, and redress in the event of false disclosure or poor performance.[10] Others have seen accountability as

---

[9]Stephen M. Barro, "An Approach to Developing Accountability Measures for the Public Schools," Phi Delta Kappan, LII, no.4 (December, 1970), p.196.

[10]Gene V. Glass, "The Many Faces of Educational Accountability," Phi Delta Kappan, LII, no.10 (June, 1972), p.636.

encompassing evaluation of the performance of an institution and responding to feedback from those who want it as well as those who avail themselves of its services.[11] Some have accepted the viewpoint that accountability means requiring educators to be paid in accordance with results of their services. This viewpoint encompasses three general principles:

1. The professional staff of a school is to be collectively responsible for knowing as much as it can (a) about the intellectual and personal-social development of the students in its charge and (b) about the conditions and educational services that may be facilitating or impeding the students' development.
2. The professional staff of a school is to be held collectively responsible for using this knowledge as best it can to maximize the development of its students toward certain clearly defined and agreed upon student performance objectives.
3. The board of education has a corresponding responsibility to provide the means and technical assistance whereby the staff of each school can acquire, interpret, and use the information necessary for carrying out the two foregoing functions.[12]

---

[11] Luvern L. Cunningham, "Our Accountability Problem," Emerging Patterns of Administrative Accountability, ed. Lesley H. Browder, Jr. (Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1971), p.47.

[12] Henry S. Dyer, "Toward Objective Criteria of Professional Accountability in the Schools of New York City," Phi Delta Kappan, LII, no.4 (December, 1970), p.206.

At this point the reader may well ask which of the many definitions of accountability should Richmond Technical Institute accept. The answer to this question will be realized only after the faculty and staff at Richmond Technical Institute give careful professional consideration to each of the definitions previously discussed and perhaps others which are currently being developed. As Lieberman has so appropriately stated, "It probably makes more sense to think of degrees and kinds of accountability rather than to assume that accountability either does or does not characterize education...No one should assume that any particular proposal represents the only (or perhaps even the most desirable) way to achieve accountability."[13]

---

[13] Barak Rosenshine and Barry McGaw, "Issues in Assessing Teacher Accountability in Public Education," Phi Delta Kappan, LII, no 10 (June, 1972), p.643.

Models and Approaches

There are many different approaches, or models of accountability, five of which are listed below:

1. The input-output approach
2. The accreditation or recognition approach
3. The behavioral objectives approach
4. The voucher system approach
5. The performance contracting approach[14]

A review of each of these approaches to accountability should assist the administrators of Richmond Technical Institute in providing leadership to instructors, students and citizens when the decision is made to develop an appropriate accountability program.

The input-output approach to accountability consists of attempts to relate educational resources utilized (inputs) to educational outcomes (outputs). This approach, sometimes referred to as cost-effectiveness analysis, deals with two types of inputs: monetary inputs which are converted into educators' salaries and instructional materials and equipment, and pupil inputs, representing the behaviors, skills, backgrounds, and out-of school environment of pupils who enter an educational program.[15] The outputs dealt with in this model of

---

[14] Glass, Educational Accountability, pp. 637-38.

[15] Austin D. Swanson, "Administrative Accountability Through Cost Effectiveness Analysis: A Proposal," Emerging Patterns of Administrative Accountability, ed. Lesley H. Browder, Jr. (Berkeley, California McCutchan, 1971), p.288.

accountability represent educational outcomes which are expressed in terms of pupil behaviors, skills, values, attitudes, etc., after pupils have completed an educational program. The program is them evaluated by determining the relationship between its inputs and outputs.

The accreditation or recognition approach to accountability has been used extensively by national, regional, and state accrediting agencies. Through the use of self-study guides, evaluation checklists of criteria, and observation, local educators assisted by outside specialists make determinations of the successes and shortcomings of the programs, goals, and of schools. Undoubtedly the accreditation model has resulted in numerous improvements in school programs and operations through the efforts of local educators and professional consultants. Glass has succinctly summarized the major deficiencies of the accreditation model.

> ...The current organizational structure of accreditation works against true disclosure of the operations of the schools because it is corrupted by its professional entanglements. From the public's point of view accreditation takes place behind closed doors between administrators, teachers and outside fellow professionals. Only in those rare instances where a school fails to receive certification does the community receive any pertinent data about the operation of school programs.[16]

---

[16] Glass, Educational Accountability, p.637.

One method which has been proposed to correct some of these deficiencies of the accreditation model has been the "independent educational accomplishment audit."[17] The I.E.A.A. focuses upon the educational accomplishments of a district as identified by an independent third party who is relatively free from influence by local educators or citizens. Another feature of the I.E.A.A. is that the auditor, who is specially trained for his position, reports his findings and recommendations in a public meeting.[18]

The behavioral objectives approach to accountability is based upon a belief that a child's behavior will change as a result of his learning. Those who support this accountability model are convinced that educational objectives can be made more clear if they specify precisely the kinds of behaviors desired as a result of student participation in educational programs. Once the desired behaviors are specified it is assumed that they will provide the bases for the development and evaluation of educational programs.[19]

The voucher system approach to accountability places emphasis on consumer choice. Through the use of this model, parents receive an educational voucher which may be used to

---

[17] Lessinger, Every Kid a Winner, pp.75-79.

[18] Ibid., pp.80-88.

[19] Lesley H. Browder, Jr., (ed.), Emerging Patterns of Administrative Accountability (Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1971), p.10.

pay for educational services for their children at a school of their choice. Proponents of this model believe that its adoption will force public school educators to "compete in the marketplace." By breaking what they term the "educational monopoly" of the public schools, it is assumed that the personnel of all schools will have to be accountable to their clientele.

The performance contracting approach to accountability in education consists of a process whereby an outside independent agency contracts with the board of education to provide some educational services to students. The performance contract frequently specifies the level of student performance desired with payments made to the agency on the basis of the degree of success attained by students in the program. Some contracts have clauses which specify that no payments will be made to the agency for students who do not attain some minimum level of performance.

The use of the performance contracting model is advocated by many who believe that it will assist school personnel to examine alternative educational programs without committing them to adopt the program on a permanent basis.[20] This model may also provide assistance to local educators who wish to compare results achieved through the utilization

---

[20]James A. Mecklenburger, and John A. Wilson, "The Performance Contracts in Grand Rapids," Phi Delta Kappan, LII, no. 10 (June, 1971), p.590.

of different kinds and levels of inputs.[21]

It is quite apparent from the foregoing discussion that each accountability approach or model has its own strengths and weaknesses. The task of selecting the most appropriate accountability program for Richmond Technical Institute will require a careful analysis of each of the models discussed and others which will undoubtedly be proposed in the future. The writer alone cannot select the "best" accountability model for Richmond Technical Institute. Only when the faculty and staff carefully examine and study the consequences of each of these models will they be capable of selecting the most appropriate model or combination of models into a workable accountability program.

21Charles Blaschke, "Performance Contracting Costs, Management Reform and John Q. Citizen," Phi Delta Kappan, LII, no. 4 (December, 1971), p.245.

Possible Problems and Barriers to Change

In addition to the potential benefits of educational accountability there are possible adverse effects as well. Factors which inhibit change are indications of problems which exist, and their examination may indicate the source of the problem. Some of the possible barriers in developing an accountability program include:

1. Dispite rapid social change, forces favoring the status quo in education remain strong as ever.
2. There are no precise goals set for educational institutions.
3. There is no established, systematic approach in the educational process.
4. Teacher education programs have failed to develop the skills and knowledge needed for innovation.
5. Teachers have failed to develop in themselves the habits of scholarship necessary to stay abreast of the knowledge explosion.
6. Evaluation and revision based on feedback are absent in educational institutions.
7. Many educators are reticent, suspicious, and fearful of change.[22]

Attempts to clarily vague educational goals and to establish systematic instructional methods and evaluative mechanisms are likely to be met with fear and suspicion by faculty members and administrators. Faced with these barriers, real educational change can occur only through a comprehensive commitment by the total institution.[23]

---

[22] Baker, Browell and Roueche, Accountability, p. 16.

[23] Ibid., p. 8.

PROCEDURES AND RESULTS

One of the methods used in this practicum for collecting data was a telephone survey of fourteen technical institutes and community colleges in the North Carolina Community College System (Table I). The writer talked personally to the Dean of Instruction of each institution. The deans were asked what type(s) of accountability programs they are now using. A checklist was used to record their responses (Appendix A). The information obtained from the fourteen institutions has been compiled and displayed in the form of a table. (Refer to Table II.)

Another instrument used for this practicum was a checklist type opinionnaire (Appendix B and C). The opinionnaire was designed in a checklist fashion so the instructors and administrators at Richmond Technical Institute could give an immediate response to each item, and thus take a minimum amount of time for completion.

There were twenty-six faculty members and administrators surveyed via personal interview by the writer.

The items on the opinionnaire were tallied according to the numbers of responses for each item. Responses from faculty, division chairmen and administrators were tabulated separately (Table III). Also a composite of the faculty, division chairmen and administrators' responses was compiled (Table III).

Percentages were computed on each item based on the number of opinionnaires. The percentages were put into table form to facilitate analysis and interpretation.

TABLE I

NAME AND LOCATION OF SCHOOLS SURVEYED

School	Location
Anson Technical Institute	Ansonville, N.C.
Central Carolina Technical Institute	Sanford, N.C.
Central Piedmont Community College	Charlotte, N.C.
Davidson County Community College	Lexington, N.C.
Montgomery Technical Institute	Troy, N.C.
Randolph Technical Institute	Asheboro, N.C.
Robeson Technical Institute	St. Pauls, N.C.
Rowan Technical Institute	Salisbury, N.C.
Sampson Technical Institute	Clinton, N.C.
Sandhills Community College	Southern Pines, N.C.
Stanly Technical Institute	Albemarle, N.C.
Technical Institute of Alamance	Burlington, N.C.
Western Piedmont Community College	Morganton, N.C.
W.W. Holding Technical Institute	Raleigh, N.C.

TABLE II

TYPES OF ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAMS *
NORTH CAROLINA TECHNICAL INSTITUTES
AND COMMUNITY COLLEGES, 1973 - 74

School	Formal Accountability Program	Require Behavioral Objectives	Comments
Anson T.I.	no	yes	Dean of Instruct. evals.instructors qtly.
C.Carolina T.I.	no	yes	becoming account-ability oriented
C.Piedmont C.C.	yes	yes	strong performance objectives
Davidson Co.C.C.	no	no	Dean evals.instruc-tional areas
Montgomery T.I.	no	no	Acct.via informal communication
Randolph T.I.	no	to be complete in one year	Adm.council evals. personnel ea.6 mo.
Robeson T.I.	no	yes	require course outline
Rowan T.I.	no	no	in process dev. behavioral obj.
Sampson T.I.	no	yes	
Sandhills C.C.	no	no	Fac.eval.-peer, self,student
Stanly T.I.	no	no	
T.I. of Alamance	no	yes	
W.Piedmont C.C.	no	no	syllabus of course outline
W.W.Holding T.I.	no	no	course outline

*Telephone Survey

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE III

Please respond to every statement in terms of your personal agreement or disagreement according to the following plan:

Strongly Agree - SA
Agree - A
Agree and disagree equally - U
Disagree - D
Strongly Disagree - SD

1. Accountability is just one more fad in a long line of fads.

Group	SA	A	U	D	SD
Administrators		9%	9%	63%	18%
Div. Chairmen	33%	33%	33%		
Instructors	8%	25%		33%	33%
Total	8%	19%	8%	42%	23%

2. Why can't we just be left alone to do our jobs?

Group	SA	A	U	D	SD
Administrators		9%	18%	36%	36%
Div. Chairmen		33%		66%	
Instructors	8%	17%	25%	42%	8%
Total	4%	15%	19%	42%	19%

3. We've always had to be accountable so what's all this nonsense about?

Group	SA	A	U	D	SD
Administrators		9%	18%	54%	18%
Div. Chairmen	33%	33%		33%	
Instructors		25%	33%	33%	8%
Total	4%	19%	26%	42%	12%

4. R.T.I. is doing a good job as is, so why stir things up by forcing accountability?

Group	SA	A	U	D	SD
Administrators		9%	18%	54%	18%
Div. Chairmen		66%		33%	
Instructors	8%	33%	25%	25%	8%
Total	4%	27%	19%	39%	12%

5. It's a good idea so long as everyone is going to be accountable, from top to bottom.

Group	SA	A	U	D	SD
Administrators	54%	45%			
Div. Chairmen		66%	33%		
Instructors	25%	33%	42%		
Total	35%	42%	26%		

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE III - continued

6. To be effective and accepted, those who use it and those who will be judged by it must participate in the design, implementation and review of the total system.

Group	SA	A	U	D	SD
Administrators	45%	55%			
Div. Chairmen		100%			
Instructors	50%	50%			
Total	42%	58%			

7. You can't measure job effectiveness in an educational setting.

Group	SA	A	U	D	SD
Administrators	9%		9%	45%	36%
Div. Chairmen			33%	33%	33%
Instructors		25%	42%	17%	17%
Total	4%	12%	27%	31%	27%

8. I don't trust it.

Group	SA	A	U	D	SD
Administrators	9%		9%	54%	27%
Div. Chairmen	33%	66%			
Instructors	8%	17%	25%	42%	17%
Total	12%	15%	15%	39%	19%

9. There is more protection than threat provided in the accountability process.

Group	SA	A	U	D	SD
Administrators	18%	36%	18%	9%	18%
Div. Chairmen		33%		33%	33%
Instructors	8%	42%	25%	25%	8%
Total	12%	35%	19%	19%	15%

10. No professional person can fulfill his role unless he has defined his goals or objectives for which he will be held accountable.

Group	SA	A	U	D	SD
Administrators	18%	45%	36%		
Div. Chairmen			66%	33%	
Instructors	17%	58%	8%	17%	
Total	15%	46%	27%	12%	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE III - continued

11. Any attempts to impose accountability should be resisted.

Group	SA	A	U	D	SD
Administrators				63%	36%
Div. Chairmen		66%		33%	
Instructors	8%	17%	25%	17%	33%
Total	4%	15%	12%	39%	31%

12. I simply don't understand the whole idea of performance standards and accountability very well.

Group	SA	A	U	D	SD
Administrators	9%		27%	54%	9%
Div. Chairmen		33%		33%	33%
Instructors	8%	8%	25%	42%	17%
Total	8%	8%	26%	46%	15%

13. All faculty members with equivalent experience and training should be paid the same contract salary, regardless of how well their students perform.

Group	SA	A	U	D	SD
Administrators			9%	72%	18%
Div. Chairmen				66%	33%
Instructors	8%	25%	17%	33%	17%
Total	4%	12%	12%	54%	19%

14. I am willing to be held accountable for my performance.

Group	SA	A	U	D	SD
Administrators	63%	36%			
Div. Chairmen		33%	66%		
Instructors	25%	58%	8%	8%	
Total	33%	46%	12%	4%	

15. Administrators have more to gain from performance standards than other R.T.I. employees.

Group	SA	A	U	D	SD
Administrators			18%	72%	9%
Div. Chairmen		66%		33%	
Instructors	8%	17%	33%	33%	8%
Total	4%	15%	26%	50%	8%

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

16. If I understood the idea and the process better, I'd probably be more inclined to support it.

Group	SA	A	U	D	SD
Administrators	9%	-	54%	27%	9%
Div. Chairmen			33%	33%	33%
Instructors	8%	42%	25%	25%	
Total	8%	19%	39%	27%	8%

Number in volved in survey - Breakdown

Administrators	11
Division Chairmen	3
Instructors	12
Total	26

A few general comments may sum up the reactions to the opinionnaire. First, the individual respondents showed no pattern of agreement in their interpretation of accountability. Second, there were substantial differences of opinion among the three groups (instructors, administrators and division chairmen). These differences in opinion could be attributed to their understanding or lack of understanding of the term "accountability." Many of the respondents commented that they did not trust the concept of accountability. This suggests to the writer that they view it as a threat.

Drawing conclusions from data such as the writer has assembled is laden with difficulties. There is a clear lack of agreement among my colleagues as to how accountability should, or should not, be employed. Although our opinions differ, they all have valid grounds for debate.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The writer is fully aware of the differences in perception from which one may initiate a study of educational accountability. With this in mind the writer shall, nevertheless, recommend guidelines for an accountability program at Richmond Technical Institute.

The following questions are crucial if Richmond Technical Institute is to develop and maintain an accountability model:

1. What can we expect our students to be able to do after completing a given course at Richmond Technical Institute? The answer to this question requires that all Richmond Technical Institute instructors develop specific, measurable objectives for the courses they teach. If teaching is defined as causing learning, all that is asked of the instructors is to tell in advance what students will be able to do after successfully completing the class.

2. What programs at Richmond Technical Institute are being developed to make instructors more effective in causing students to learn? This is a crucial question because some teachers have not been prepared to teach. They may have a broad knowledge of subject matter, but very little about how to help students learn.

3. Has Richmond Technical Institute provided appropriate learning activities for all students? Many of the students who enter technical institutes are illiterate or lacking in communication

> skills. Yet, by using audio-visual materials, these students can be taught how to communicate effectively while they are simultaneously learning another subject. The conventional lecture method is ill-suited for the vast majority of students who enter the technical institute and community college. Other methods of more relevant and successful learning paths must be provided.

Although the president of Richmond Technical Institute and the key members of his staff can initiate an accountability program, an acceptance of the accountability concept must permeate all levels of the institution. In fact, the writer suggests that the success of the program largely depends upon the effectiveness of those at teaching levels rather than those at administrative levels.

The writer recommends that the president and key members of his staff strive to create an open, positive sense of group participation. One way to begin is through a series of informal workshop sessions with all faculty members and administrators. Goals and broad policy objectives should be presented for discussion. All members of Richmond Technical Institute should be encouraged to express their views and feelings - both positive and negative.

The common effort of identifying goals and of validating policy objectives should keep conflicts and disputes in the open where they can be readily dealt with and resolved. By

using this participatory method the faculty and staff will probably view accountability as an institutional challenge rather than a threat. After a common agreement on policy objectives is achieved, the president should elect a committee to determine how well Richmond Technical Institute is accomplishing its mission. This pre-audit should be of both the internal and external environment of Richmond Technical Institute.

External Analysis:

1. How well has Richmond Technical Institute filled the professional service needs of Richmond County
2. How well has Richmond Technical Institute filled the technical occupational needs
3. What has happened to students who have completed the transfer program; how many have entered four-year colleges; how many have persisted until graduation
4. How well are local industrial needs being met
5. To what extent are the general educational needs of adults in Richmond County being met

Internal Analysis

1. An analysis of the effectiveness of the instructional components
2. An analysis of the effectiveness of administration in supporting the individual teacher and insuring that the needs of students are met
3. An analysis of the effectiveness of communications within Richmond Technical Institute

After completing the pre-audit, the committee should develop a report documenting their findings. Based on the findings the committee should establish priorities by recommending corrective action in the order considered most important. If capable of doing so, the committee should estimate the cost and time required to complete corrective actions.

The president and his staff should study the committee's report and evaluate recommendations using the following typical questions as criteria:

(a) Is it feasible?

(b) Is sufficient information available to allow each recommendation to be considered and then formed into a tentative objective?

(c) Are the recommendations in consonance with established goals of Richmond Technical Institute?

(d) Can the recommendations be undertaken within present or future budget limitations?

The president and his staff would then prepare a final report, in which priorities would be listed for presentation to the entire faculty and staff for their consideration. This entire procedure could also be employed on a departmental level.

Implementing a program of accountability at Richmond Technical Institute will require changes in traditional educational attitudes. The faculty of Richmond Technical Institute could be the key element in effecting change, but teachers cannot be

held accountable unless the total institution is dedicated to that end. A sincere endorsement of accountability must prevail within all sectors of Richmond Technical Institute.

In conclusion, the writer feels that accountability is a privilege - not a burden. It calls forth the best within us. It challenges us to examine our true purposes, that is, to really be of service to our students.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX A

Name of institution:

Does school utilize a formal accountability program?

yes _____ no _____

Does school require its instructors to develop behavioral objectives?

yes _____ no _____

Additional comments:

APPENDIX B

MEMORANDUM March 14, 1974

To: Faculty and Staff

From: Lewis Baber

As part of my doctoral program I am conducting research on the subject of educational accountability. As a part of this process, I would appreciate your assistance in determining current attitudes on our campus regarding accountability and performance standards. During the next two weeks I would like to interview each full time faculty and staff member. A frank expression of your opinion will help me in obtaining a reliable attitude measurement. My thanks for your cooperation.

APPENDIX C

This questionnaire is an attempt to obtain your opinion on the ussue of accountability and performance standards. I am interested only in your agreement or disagreement with the following statements, and not in the truth or falsity of them. In some cases you may feel you do not have enough information to make a judgment; in such instances I would like you to make the best judgment possible.

Please read every statement and respond to it in terms of your personal agreement or disagreement according to the following plan:

Strongly Agree	Agree	Agree and Disagree Equally	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
SA	A	U	D	SD

_____1. Accountability is just one more fad in a long line of fads.

_____2. Why can't we just be left alone to do our jobs?

_____3. We've always had to be accountable so what's all this nonsense about?

_____4. R.T.I. is doing a good job as is, so why stir things up by forcing accountability?

_____5. It's a good idea so long as everyone is going to be accountable, from top to bottom.

_____6. To be effective and accepted, those who use it and those who will be judged by it must participate in the design, implementation and review of the total system.

_____7. You can't measure job effectiveness in an educational setting.

_____8. I don't trust it.

_____9. There is more protection than threat provided in the accountability process.

_____10. No professional person can fulfill his role unless he has defined his goals or objectives for which he will be held accountable.

_____11. Any attempts to impose accountability should be resisted.

_____12. I simply don't understand the whole idea of performance standards and accountability very well.

_____13. All faculty members with equivalent experience and training should be paid the same contract salary, regardless of how well their students perform.

_____14. I am willing to be held accountable for my performance.

_____15. Administrators have more to gain from performance standards than other R.T.I. employees.

_____16. If I understood the idea and the process better, I'd probably be more inclined to support it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Austin, Gilbert R. "Educational Accountability: Hallmark of the 1970's," Science Teacher, 38 (April, 1971): 26-8.

Bain, Helen. "Self-Governance Must Come First, Then Accountability," Phi Delta Kappan, 51 (April, 1970): 413.

Barro, S.M. "An Approach to Developing Accountability Measures for the Public Schools." Phi Delta Kappan, 52 (1970): 196-205.

Blaschke, Charles. "Performance Contracting Costs, Management Reform and John Q. Citizen." Phi Delta Kappan, LII, no.4 (December, 1971): 245.

Bloom, Benjamin S. Stability and Change in Human Characteristics. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1964.

Browder, Lesley H.Jr. Emerging Patterns of Administrative Accountability, Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1971.

Caroline, Donald E. "Why Do You Teach? Or How Accountable Are You?" Journal of Reading. 14 (March, 1971): 385-6.

Chavez, Simon J. "Performance Accountability in Teacher Education." Audio-Visual Instruction 16 (March, 1971): 56-7.

Cunningham, Luvern L. "Our Accountability Problem." Emerging Patterns of Administrative Accountability. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1971.

Dyer, Henry S. "Toward Objective Criteria of Professional Accountability in the Schools of New York City." Phi Delta Kappan, LII, no.4 (December, 1970): 206.

Elam, Stanley. "The Age of Accountability Dawns in Texarkana." Phi Delta Kappan, 51 (June, 1970): 509-14.

_____. "The Chameleon's Dish." Phi Delta Kappan, 51 (September, 1970): 71-2.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

DEC 06 1974

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

English, T. and Zaharis, J. "Are Accountability and Governance Compatible?" Phi Delta Kappan, 52 (February, 1971) 374-5.

Garrison, Roger H. Junior College Faculty: Issues and Problems, Preliminary National Appraisal. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1967. (ED 012 177).

Glass, Gene V. "The Many Faces of Educational Accountability." Phi Delta Kappan, LII, no.10 (June, 1972): 636.

Grieder, Calvin. "Education Should Welcome Pressure for Accountability." Nations Schools, (May, 1970): 14.

Harlacher, Ervin L. and Roberts, Eleanor. "Accountability for Student Learning." Junior College Journal 41 (March, 1971): 26-30.

Hemple, Marvin W. "Accountability and Technology: A Change of Emphasis for Business Education." Audio-Visual Instruction 16 (May, 1971): 32.

Hyer, Anna L. "From Gold Stars to Green Stamps." Audio-Visual Instruction 16 (May, 1971): 4.

Idstein, Peter. "Count Ability and the Draggin." Phi Delta Kappan, 52 (April, 1971): 508-9.

Jordon, Bennett. "Educational Accountability; A Crucial Question." Junior College Journal 41 (March, 1971): 23-5.

Lessinger, Leon M. Every Kid A Winner: Accountability in Education. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1970.

_____. "Engineering Accountability for Results in Public Education." Phi Delta Kappan, 52 (1970): 217-225.

_____ and Allen, Dwight H. "Performance Proposals for Education Funding." Phi Delta Kappan, 51 (November, 1969): 136-7.

Matzkus, John E. "Accountability and the Reverend Dogood." Today's Education 60 (March, 1971): 57.

Mecklenburger, James A. and Wilson, John A. "The Performance Contracts in Grand Rapids." Phi Delta Kappan, LII, no.10 (June, 1971): 590.

Morris, John E. "Accountability: Watchword for the 70's." Clearing House 45 (February, 1971): 323-8.

Ratliff, Frank E. "Accountability at What Cost?" English Journal 60 (April, 1971): 485-90.

Rosenshine, Barak and McCaw, Barry. "Issues in Assessing Teacher Accountability in Public Education." Phi Delta Kappan, LLI, no.10 (June, 1972): 643.

Roueche, John E. Salvage, Redirection, or Custody? Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges. 1968.

_____, Baker, George A. III; Browell, Richard L. Accountability and the Community College. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1971.

_____ and Herrscher, Barton R. "A Learning - Oriented System of Instruction." Junior College Journal 41 (October, 1970).

_____ and Hurlbert. "Research on Junior College Teachers." Junior College Research Review 2 (March, 1968).

Schure, Alexander. "Accountability and Evaluation Design for Occupational Education." Educational Technology 11 (March, 1971): 26-37.

Seitz, Judith. "Teacher's Guide to Performance Contracting." Grade Teacher 88 (April, 1971): 32-5.

Stenner, Jack. "Accountability by Public Demand." American Vocational Journal 46 (February, 1971): 33-7.

Stocker, Joseph. "Accountability and the Classroom Teacher." Today's Education. 60 (March, 1971): 41-50.

Swanson, Austin D. "Administrative Accountability Through Cost Effectiveness Analysis - A Proposal." Emerging Patterns of Administrative Accountability. Berkeley, California: McCutchan, 1971.

Voegel, G.H. "Accountability and Performance Contracting Implications for the Supportive Staff." Audio-Visual Instruction 16 (May, 1971): 16-8.

Williams, Lois. "Governance is Integral to Accountability." Today's Education 60 (April, 1971): 59-60.